



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,644	01/28/2004	Zhidong Zhu	5008	6589
48227	7590	03/18/2005	EXAMINER	
ENGELHARD CORPORATION 101 WOOD AVENUE ISELIN, NJ 08830			BROWN, JENNINE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1755	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/766,644	ZHU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jennine M. Brown	1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,5,6,9,10 and 16-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3,4,7,8 and 10-15 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/5/04: 1/28/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements submitted on 1/28/04 and 8/5/04 have been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 16-21 are drawn to a method of making an impact copolymer but fail to give any functional recitation that the olefin must contact the first and second catalyst compositions and whether they are contacted simultaneously or sequentially to provide the product claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/ Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1755

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-2, 5-6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ashton, et al. (US 6136745).

Ashton, et al. disclose a polyethylene catalyst comprising a dialkyl magnesium (col. 2, l. 41-50), tetraalkyl orthosilicate (tetraethyl orthosilicate - ES70 manufactured by Crosfield; col. 2, l. 51-59; col. 7, l. 5-7), chlorinated silicon compound (col. 5, l. 30-38), organoaluminum (col. 2, l. 60-64) and a titanium compound (col. 1, l. 39-67; col. 5, l. 66-67). A method for making a catalyst is also given (col. 3, l. 51-col. 6, l. 17).

It is the examiner's position that the tetraalkyl orthosilicate carrier inherently has the property of a spherical support with a particle diameter from 0.1 micron to 250 microns which either anticipates or renders the claimed product obvious and the burden of proof that it does not does not shifts to the applicant as *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1877). Applicants have not provided examples with a showing that the

claimed catalyst support aids said catalyst in providing improved level of control over the properties of the resultant polymer product's glass transition temperature, adhesion properties, coefficients of temperature induced expansion/contraction or improved flowability over a silicon based support or any other zeolite based support.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-4, 7-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Prior art fails to teach or fairly disclose the specific Markush group listed of alkyl silicates or the Markush group listed for the magnesium halides and alkyl magnesium halides.

Claims 11-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a catalyst support for a catalyst system comprising the steps of contacting a magnesium compound, specifically a magnesium halide or alkyl magnesium halide, with an alkyl silicate in a liquid medium to form a mixture, heating said mixture to form a substantially spherical catalyst support having a diameter from about 30 to about 150 microns (on a 50% by volume basis).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennine M. Brown whose telephone

number is (571) 272-1364. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 9:30 AM - 7:30 PM; Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jmb



J.A. LORENZO
PRIMARY EXAMINER